DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 291 EA 019 355

AUTHOR Neufeld, Barbara; And Others
TITLE Hartford Effective Schools Initiative: Summer Institute Phase Evaluation Report.
PUB DATE 30 Sep 84
NOTE 86p.; For related documents, see ED 275 715 and EA 019 354.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Classroom Techniques; Elementary Education; Experiential Learning; *Inservice Teacher Education; Paraprofessional Personnel; Parent Participation; Questionnaires; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Workshops; Teaching Methods; Teaching Models; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS Connecticut (Hartford)

ABSTRACT

The summer institute phase of the Hartford Effective Schools Initiative is evaluated in this report. Part 1 includes (1) an overview of training content; (2) a section on trainers' methods, assessing strengths and weaknesses; (3) participants' responses to training based on observations by the evaluation staff and informal interviews with attending teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals; and (4) a summary of the participant survey, stating that participants were in substantial agreement with the positive report of the independent qualitative evaluation. Part 2 includes (1) the qualitative evaluation for the additional training provided during the clinical experience; (2) a summary of participants' evaluation reported on the Summer Training Evaluation form; (3) responses to the clinical experience based on formal interviews in which participants were asked about the actual classroom implementation and the coaching component; (4) questionnaire data compiled at the end of the training period; (5) an observation of parent training; and (6) a summary of the clinical experience indicating that the majority of the participants were able to effectively demonstrate knowledge of the vocabulary and ideas and believed that they had acquired teaching and supervisory skills that would improve their work with children. Twelve tables and two appendices (evaluation instruments and comments from the forms) are included. (WTH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED281291

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. LaFontaine

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HARTFORD EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS INITIATIVE

Summer Institute Phase Evaluation Report

Prepared by

Fieldwork Team

Barbara Neufeld

Quantitative Survey Team

Robert Gable
Edward Iwaniecki

September 30, 1984

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HARTFORD EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS INITIATIVE

SUMMER TRAINING INSTITUTE
EVALUATION REPORT

Part One: Intensive One Week Training

Part One of the evaluation report begins with an overview of the training content provided during the first week. This section on content is followed by a section describing the trainer's methods, strengths and weaknesses and the participants' responses to the training. It is based on observations by the evaluation staff (at least one of whom was in attendance each day of the training) and on informal interviews with a sample of attending teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals. Part One of this report concludes with a section summarizing the total participant survey. Participants were in substantial agreement with the positive report of the independent, qualitative evaluation.

Training Content. Rob Hunter began the week of HESI training with a formidable task before him. He had the opportunity to influence positively the teaching capacity of approximately 150 teachers, administrators and paraprofessionals, who had chosen to participate in this training project. However the school staff had just completed a year of school work, and most were tired. They wondered what any trainer could provide that merited sitting through five consecutive days of intensive training that lasted from 8 a.m. until 1 p.m. By the end of the first day, the skepticism was receding. Most participants seemed to agree that the day had been worthwhile. Rob's personal style and ability, coupled with the saliency of the material, had captured the participants' attention and interest.

Rob's agenda for the first day of training was to present through example, modeling, role playing, and some didactic teaching, the conception of teaching as decision making, three categories of teacher decision making and six variables of motivation. The areas of teacher decision making were 1. content decisions (what is to be taught); 2. learner behavior decisions (how children learn and how they can demonstrate that they have learned); and 3. teacher behavior decisions (what teachers can do to maximize student learning).

Sensitive to the issue of teaching being both an art and a science, Rob stressed early in the presentation that the training was not designed to create teachers who were alike. Rather, he recognized that teachers have their unique personalities and styles, and said that the goal of the training was to increase teachers' awareness of the decisions that they make so that they can better accomplish their goals within their own teaching styles. He said, "We can't tell you how to teach; but it's a decision making process and we can help with what to think about while teaching." This was an important distinction to make early in training, as teachers would not have been receptive to the idea that the goal of training was to create teachers all of whom did things in the same manner in their classrooms. Nor would they have accepted a message that suggested that despite years of experience, they knew little about classroom teaching. Rob's approach successfully reinforced and built on teachers' knowledge that they have considerable skill already in both managing classrooms and teaching children.

During the remainder of Day One, Rob taught about motivation and its concommitants or "states" as he called them. He taught about

1. extrinsic versus intrinsic motivation; 2. level of concern (how intensely the student feels the desire to learn the specific lesson and what the teacher can do to increase the level of concern); 3) use of feedback to increase student motivation; 4) success as a motivator; 5. using the teaching content to increase motivation; and 6. feeling tone (a continuum from pleasant to unpleasant) that accompanies learning.

During Day Two he taught about reinforcement theory, emphasizing that this theory is effective with all people. If a reinforcement doesn't work with a particular child, it is not because the theory is wrong; it is because the particular reinforcement in use is not a reinforcement for the child. It is the teacher's job to make sure that what he or she chooses as a reinforcement actually works as one for the child. He stressed positive over negative reinforcers (although he noted that negative reinforcements do have their use) and the need to push children toward intrinsic reinforcement rather than toward extrinsic reinforcement. The goal is to create in children the desire to work hard at school work because it is what they want to do and not because of the teacher's wishes.

Again stressing the positive, Rob suggested that teachers pay attention to reinforcing the 95% of the children in class who are doing the right thing, rather than always looking at the one or two who are not acting appropriately (although he provided examples of using reinforcement theory to improve the behavior and work patterns of those children). And he noted that it was important to reinforce an approximation of appropriate behavior and not only the perfect response. He called this "preventive reinforcement," and noted that it makes children aware that teachers are accepting their efforts, not only their perfect accomplishments.

He suggested that children will be more inclined to participate in a positive manner, rather than negative, if they have a positive way to participate even when they are not always perfect. Rob spent a sufficient amount of time dealing with the topic of children with severe behavior problems and how to use reinforcement theory to ameliorate and eliminate their behaviors, in addition to stressing the need to use positive reinforcement with all children.

After reinforcement theory, the remainder of Day Two was spent on the topic of learning theory: how to make learning more meaningful to students; how to increase the rate at which children learn.

Day Three focused on 1. Task Analysis: how to take a more complex task and break it down into simpler tasks, and 2. Lesson Design. The goal of task analysis is to structure lessons so that they make sense to the learners. More specifically, task analysis helps the teacher to identify essential components of teaching and thereby simplifies the teaching process. It turns the essential components into diagnostic questions: can the student do "x?"

Task analysis also assists the teacher in making decisions about which curricular materials to use to teach toward the essential components. In the process, it makes teachers better consumers of commercially prepared materials (including textbooks), many of which, according to Rob, are quite poorly structured to teach the tasks they purport to teach. Finally, as a result of the care involved in task analysis, it is a process that ultimately makes teaching more effective and efficient. Day Three moved teachers into the heart of what they do in classrooms wiht respect to content. It provided them with a way to make decisions about lesson objectives, component parts and sequencing.

Day Three ended with a serious discussion of Lesson Design. Rob presented a series of steps or questions to ask oneself in designing a lesson, but stressed that he was not proposing a "recipe" approach to lesson design. One should not, he stressed, judge the quality of a lesson by counting the elements of lesson design. The quality should depend on whether the necessary steps have been included. The steps that Rob described were: 1. Anticipatory Set (getting the kids' attention); 2. Objective and Purpose; 3. Input (decisions about the information that students need in order to be successful learners); 4. Modeling (auditory and/or visual) so the learners can try out what they are learning; 5. Checking for Understanding (done throughout a lesson and not only at the end); 6. Guided Practice; and 7. Independent Practice.

Day Four included a review of Lesson Design in which participants watched a film of a teaching segment. The film was used to help participants focus on the various features of lesson design. Much of the remainder of the day was devoted to a discussion of learner styles. Rob reviewed recent research on brain functions, describing the ways in which the right and left hemispheres are different. He defined the left side of the brain as dominant in organizing reality by time, thinking in words; as sequential, analytic and temporal. In contrast, the right side of the brain organizes reality by space, thinks in images and is wholistic and spatial. Although both sides of the brain function in concert, Rob's message was that individuals differ with respect to which side is dominant. In trying to help create appropriate learning tasks for children, Rob stressed that teachers be sure the structure learning

tasks so that they include activities that respond to both sides of the brain. Then, regardless of the side of the brain that is dominant, children will have opportunities to learn.

The fifth day of training presented some new material, provided an overview of the training, and then saw teachers off to their classrooms for the start of the clinical experience with children, each other and the trainers. Rob talked about the need for consistency in setting up classroom rules and regulations at the start of the school year, and suggested that it was important to focus on classroom mangement and de-emphasize academics at the beginning of the school year until children have learned the routines. He proposed that teachers emphasize classroom management by providing activities that are academically unchallenging but useful in reinforcing positive behaviors.

The next segment of the last day provided teachers with 12 "sponge" activities; activities to use when there are small pieces of time available for learning -- during transition times for example. These are short duration, highly intense, motivating, learning games such as Hangman, Silly Sally, and In/Out Machine. Each is a game that teachers can easily adapt to the content level of a current class.

Rob concluded with a review of the kinds of decision making that had been the subject of the week's training: content, teacher, and learner decisions. He suggested that participants begin to include small bits of the training in their settings and not try to become proficient in all of it at once. But he urged them to practice what they have learned because as with children's learning, "I can predict that if you don't practice, you will forget it. But distribute your practice

periodically, and don't try to do the whole thing." With that message, amidst enthusiastic applause, the formal, one-week training was concluded.

Trainer's Methods, Strengths and Weaknesses. Without doubt, the one week intensive training provided by Robin Hunter was of the highest quality and met the expectations of virtually all participants. Perhaps the quality and success of the week-long training can best be summarized by the teacher who pulled Rob aside on the fourth day of training and said, "I have been teaching for 16 years and this is the first in-service that I have enjoyed. And I am learning too!" There was much in Rob's teaching style that merited such enthusiasm. Teachers, administrators and paraprofessionals should also be commended for their level of involvement with the training provided.

Rob Hunter was extraordinarily effective in maintaining the attention and interest of a group of 150 teachers, administrators and paraprofessionals for five consecutive days. He was able to do this through 1. expert knowledge of the training content, 2. force of personality, 3. myriad examples that illustrated his conceptual information and continually re-established his credibility as someone with knowledge of real classrooms and schools, 4. modeling the teaching behaviors that he was speaking about, and 5. careful attention of his audience. He was lively at all times, altering the pace and timing of his teaching in response to his sense of participants' feelings. He used frequent "coffee breaks" to give participants (and no doubt himself) a chance to stretch, chat and relax after each intensive teaching period. Rob encouraged teachers' questions and responded fully to them. He tended to involved participants in a passive way by asking their names and using them as foils or

examples against which he would role play. In all, it was a masterful implementation of this training project. The paragraphs that follow point out in greater detail the method, many strengths and few weaknesses of the training.

METHODS

1. The trainer affirmed school staffs' knowledge of schools and teaching. He in no way suggested that trainees were beginning with little or no useful knowledge of their jobs. Instead, Rob indicated that the goals of this staff development were a) to validate with research what staff were already doing; b) to bring to the forefront things that they used to do but have forgotten about; and c) to bring some new ideas to teaching. By taking this positive approach to staff and to the training, Rob minimized much participant defensiveness and encouraged an openness to the training.

2. The trainer modeled the kind of teaching he was describing. For example, when Rob spoke about ways to raise the level of concern for a child, a key to increasing the probability of student learning, he mentioned proximity -- the teacher standing near to a child who might not be completely attentive. As he spoke about this, he moved near to a participant who seemed not to be attentive, and he noted what he was doing in a humorous, not negative or demeaning manner. He called on participants by name, another way of raising level of concern. Modeling enabled participants to see and experience the effect of the teaching in addition to hearing Rob talk about it.

3. The trainer expertly used school-based examples. For virtually every point that the trainer made, he had one or more classroom based

examples that brought it to life. He spoke about real teachers and students by name (not necessarily real names) so that the participants had an image of the child, teacher and setting. His ability to create vivid visual images with words enabled participants to "see" the classroom situation and imagine the impact of the specific teaching techniques. Rob would refer back to these examples in subsequent teaching segments, and participants could recall the setting as if they had actually been there themselves. Use of examples turned theoretical into usable knowledge. In addition, it established and continually re-established Rob's credibility as someone who knew about classrooms, teaching and schools.

4. The trainer made masterful use of the overhead projector. By design, Rob Hunter did not use pre-printed transparencies, but instead wrote on blank ones as he went along. This method encouraged participants to pay attention in order to see the point he was trying to make. In a sense, Rob maintained interest by whetting participants' appetite for what would appear next on the transparency. He frequently shut the projector off in order to make its presence more salient when he turned it on again. Pre-printed transparencies, or handouts would not have served to maintain participant attention as effectively as this use of the overhead. Finally, not having handouts encouraged participants to take notes, further engaging them actively in the learning process.

5. The trainer reviewed frequently the material that had been discussed in previous sessions and related it to current learnings. During the five days the trainer presented a great deal of information. By using reviews at the end of sessions, immediately after breaks, and

at other times, he was able to remind participants of where they had been, why it mattered, and where they were going. This method made the wealth of material manageable to the participants.

6. The trainer used impromptu events as teaching examples. Rob brought a sense of humor and good teaching technique to the training that could be seen in his response to impromptu events. The events and the humor were put to good teaching use. For example, at one point Rob was interrupted by Mary Wilson who announced that someone's car was blocking the Superintendent's car. Mary read off the license and there was silence and then nervous laughter in the room as someone got up to move the car. As the individual left, Rob turned back to the group and said, "what were we talking about before the interruption?" He then stopped himself and emphasized what he had done as a teaching technique: he had engaged the group in the learning process by asking them to do the remembering. He pointed out that he had not said, "Before the interruption we were talking about ..." There were several instances throughout the training in which Rob made use of his own teaching explicitly to demonstrate aspects of teaching that he wanted to emphasize.

7. The trainer encouraged questions. Rob encouraged participants to ask questions, suggesting that if individuals felt uncomfortable asking them in the large group they could write their questions on paper and leave them at the front of the room during breaks or at the start or end of the training day. Participants increasingly did ask questions as the week continued, and Rob responded thoroughly to each one. The depth of his response, and the seriousness with which he took each question served both as a model for participants and as an encouragement

to others to raise their questions. Encouraging questions also helped to produce a sense of smaller scale in what was a very large group situation. It fostered additional active rather than passive engagement with the training.

8. The trainer conveyed high expectations and a realistic view of life in schools. Rob stressed that by implementing the training in their classrooms teachers could improve the probability that children would learn. He affirmed that teachers make a difference in the lives of children. However, he also noted that some children come to school with multiple, long-term problems that the school cannot solve. Recognizing the difficulty of teaching those children, Rob emphasized that the teacher must take smaller steps, developing discrete goals and objectives that can help the child. He noted that this task is not easy and that he could not guarantee success with all children. "The effort," he said, "is to contain and improve those kids who we can." He spent about one third of one day's sessions detailing ways in which teachers and administrators can assist those children who exhibit extremely negative behavior to begin to eliminate those behaviors and substitute more positive ones.

9. Trainer responded to the concerns of this particular group of participants. Rob Hunter was presenting a carefully planned training project which has a generic core. However he was adept in tailoring it to the particular questions and concerns of this group of participants. The best example of this can be found in his response to participant concern about a film he had shown. On the fourth day of training, Rob showed a film of a teaching segment, stopping the film frequently to

point out aspects of the teacher's behavior that he wanted to emphasize. Some participants remarked with concern that although the teaching methods seemed to work successfully, the children in the classroom on the film were unlike those they face in Hartford. They were skeptical that the methods would work with their children in their classrooms. After the training day, Rob viewed a videotape made in a Hartford school and then showed that film on the fifth day of training to indicate that indeed these teaching methods can work in Hartford. He was aided in this segment by a participating administrator who was implementing Hunter's model in his school. Taking the time to show this film minimized the objection that "this won't work here."

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The list of methods detailed above constitute the core of the strength of the training program. Rob took a large body of information and assembled it into manageable teaching units which he implemented with skill and considerable flair. The content, described in the previous section, was not necessarily new but it was important material packaged in a way that made it accessible to teachers, administrators and paraprofessionals. As Rob stated at the outset of the training, the purpose of staff development is to provide some new information, and also to remind school people of what they once knew but had forgotten or perhaps neglected to use. With this goal in mind, the training content was appropriate and successfully implemented.

The sequencing of teaching units was well designed. The first two days were spent on subjects distant from the core of teaching -- reinforcement theory and motivation. During these days Rob developed his

own credibility and built trust in the participants. Only then did he introduce the subject of task analysis, the heart of teacher decision making. Had he begun with this sensitive and crucial topic, it is doubtful that participants would have been ready to tackle it. Rob was an excellent choice for trainer because his knowledge, experience, style and sensitivity gave him high credibility with the participants and enabled trainer and participants to work together successfully for a common goal -- the improvement of instruction.

If there was any weakness in the training, it came as a result of the intense format of the program. Despite Rob's ability to "hold" the audience, some participants suggested that the novelty of his approach was wearing off by Wednesday, and that they were having difficulty absorbing all of the information. Nonetheless, it was apparent from observing participants during training, that they were attentive for all five days; returning from breaks on time; appearing for the start of the day on time, continuing to take notes and ask questions.

The size of the room and group was a handicap. It was difficult for Rob to get physically close to so many people and to the people at the back and far sides of the room as he was tethered to the microphone at the front. Some participants did seem to drift out of attention at the fringes of the group, perhaps as a function of space. Again, this has to be seen as a minor weakness in what was otherwise an exceptionally strong program.

Participants should be commended for their continuing involvement throughout the training. At the start of the first day, only a few participants were taking notes; but mid-morning most seemed to be

writing. With the exception of a small group of staff members who sat at the back of the room embroidering or reading the newspaper, participants kept their attention on Rob's presentation. There was little chatting or off-task work apparent during the week. Participants laughed at his stories and nodded with recognition at many of his school examples. They were learning, and they were enjoying the experience. A more detailed description of participants' response to the training follows in the next section of this report.

Participant Survey: Hunter One Week Training

The teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators attending the Summer Institute 1-week training provided by Rob Hunter completed an evaluation form entitled Pre-Clinical Training Evaluation Form (see Appendix A). The form asked the participants to evaluate the training in the areas of accomplishing workshop objectives, the presenter, training content and outcomes, and to offer recommendations for additional training.

Table 1 presents a breakdown of the 113 personnel from Hooker, King and Sand schools representing the 1-week only and full 6-week training time groups who completed the surveys. Note that the paraprofessional and administrator respondents were all participating in the six-week component.[1]

---

[1]An additional group of 30 people indicated they were from other Hartford schools and were not included in the analyses.

Workshop Objectives. The participants were asked to rate the extent that the workshop objectives were achieved using the following scale: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Somewhat, 3 - Mostly, and 4 - Completely. Table 2 lists the 11 workshop objectives followed by the response percentages by school for the three participant groups (i.e., T=Teacher, P=Paraprofessional, A=Administrator) and the 1-week only and full 6-week participants. Emphasis in this text will be placed upon the school total percentages and the summary of all schools presented in the boxed-in area for each objective. Readers may wish to further examine the responses fo the three groups and two training time breakdowns also presented.

Perusal of the total percentages listed for the "All Schools" column indicates that, overall, at least 80% of all participants felt that all of the 11 objectives were "Mostly" or "Completely" achieved. These ratings are quite positive and support the conclusions of the independent evaluators as to the quality training provided by Rob Hunter. No discernible differences were found between the 1-week and 6-week teacher groups and no differences appeared among the opinions of the staff from the three schools.

Participants were asked to comment on the achievement of the workshop objectives. Five teachers offered comments as follows:

"I think Rob is doing an excellent job of presenting this incredible amount of information in five days."

"Excellent."

"More checking for understanding, although this is hard for a large group."

"Informative -- helped to focus on many things we actually do in teaching -- by greater awareness it should help us to be more effective."

Table 1

Number of Hunter Training Survey Respondents
by School, Group and Training Time

Group	Weeks of Training	School			Total
		Hooker	King	Sand	
Teachers	1	11	12	6	87
	6	17	22	19	
Paraprofessionals	6	4	10	6	20
Administrators	6	2	2	2	6
TOTAL		34	46	33	113[a]

[a]A total of six participants did not properly complete the survey; an additional group of 30 participants indicated that they were not from the Hooker, King or Sand schools. This report is based on the remaining 113/149 survey forms from the three schools.

Table 2

Participant Ratings of Accomplishment of Hunter Workshop Objectives by School, Group and Training Time

Objectives	Group[a]	Training[b]	Hooker[c] 1	2	3	4	King 1	2	3	4	Sand 1	2	3	4	All Schools 1	2	3	4
Participants will be able to:																		
List the three categories of teacher decisions	T	1			9	91[d]	8	25	67				67	33	3	28	69	
		6			29	71	4	23	73				26	74	2	26	72	
	P	6	25	75				30	70		33	50	17		15	45	40	
	A	6			50	50		50	50				100			33	67	
	TOTAL			3	28	69	4	29	67		6	34	60		4	30	66	
List the six variables of motivation and the generalizations of each	T	1			36	64	8	42	50				50	50	3	42	55	
		6	12	18	70		5	36	59		5	42	53		7	33	60	
	P	6			100			50	50				50	50		60	40	
	A	6			50	50		50	50				50	50		50	50	
	TOTAL			6	36	58	4	42	54		3	46	51		4	41	55	
List the four principles of reinforcement theory and the definition of each	T	1			27	73	17	17	66		17	33	50		10	24	66	
		6	12	41	47		5	36	59				47	53	5	42	53	
	P	6	50	50				40	60				67	33	10	50	40	
	A	6			50	50		50	50				50	50		50	50	
	TOTAL			11	42	47	6	36	58		5	48	46		8	41	51	
Design a behavior strategy to change an unproductive individual or group behavior	T	1			55	45	17	50	33		17	67	16		10	55	35	
		6	6	41	53		4	64	32		10	58	32		7	55	38	
	P	6	75		25		10	30	60				50	50	20	10	50	
	A	6			100			50	50				50	50		67	33	
	TOTAL			11	47	42	8	52	40		9	54	37		9	51	40	
List, explain and apply the variables of effective practice	T	1			55	45	17	33	50		17	83			10	52	38	
		6	18	41	41			71	29		16	58	26		10	58	32	
	P	6	75		25		10	20	70		33	50	17		30	25	45	
	A	6			100			50	50				50	50		67	33	
	TOTAL			17	47	36	6	51	43		20	60	20		14	52	34	
List the steps of task analysis and apply it to a self-selected content area	T	1			18	82	8		42	50			33	17	3		42	55
		6			29	71			50	50	16	52	32			5	45	50
	P	6	25	25	25	25		10	20	70	17	33	50		5	15	25	55
	A	6			50	50			100				50	50			67	33
	TOTAL			3	3	28	56	2	2	46	50	11	37	32		2	5	44	49

Table 2 (cont.)

Objectives	Group[a]	Weeks of Training[b]	Hooker[c] 1	2	3	4	King 1	2	3	4	Sand 1	2	3	4	All Schools 1	2	3	4
List and explain the elements of lesson design	T	1			18	82[d]		17	33	50			67	33		7	34	59
		6			59	41			33	67			58	42			49	51
	P	6		50	25	25			40	60		33	17	50		20	30	50
	A	6				100			100				50	50			50	50
	TOTAL			6	36	58		4	41	55		6	54	40		5	43	52
Observe lessons and label elements of effective teaching	T	1			27	73	8	8	34	50			80	20	4	4	39	53
		6		6	59	35		14	36	50		11	47	42		10	47	43
	P	6		75	25			10	20	70		20	20	60		26	21	53
	A	6			50	50		50	50				50	50		17	50	33
	TOTAL			11	44	45	2	13	33	52		9	52	39	1	11	42	46
Explain the functions of both halves of the brain	T	1			18	82			33	67			50	50			31	69
		6			31	69		5	18	77			63	37		2	37	61
	P	6			75	25		10	30	60			33	67		5	40	55
	A	6			50	50				100			50	50			33	67
	TOTAL				31	69		4	27	69			54	46		2	36	62
List the three implications of brain research in education	T	1		9	36	55	9	9	27	55		33	33	34	4	14	32	50
		6	6	12	41	41		9	46	45		32	42	26	2	17	43	38
	P	6		50	50			10	20	70			80	20		16	42	42
	A	6		50		50			50	50			50	50		17	33	50
	TOTAL		3	19	36	42	2	9	38	51		24	50	26	2	16	41	41
List, explain and apply the six levels of Bloom's Taxonomy	T	1			18	82	9		36	55		17	33	50	4	4	29	64
		6		12	41	47		14	27	59		11	47	42		12	38	50
	P	6		25	75			10	40	50			67	33		10	55	35
	A	6			50	50		50		50			50	50		17	33	50
	TOTAL			8	36	56	2	11	30	57		9	51	40	1	9	38	52

[a]Group: T = Teacher
P = Paraprofessional
A = Administrator

[b]Weeks of Training: 1 = 1 week only
6 = Full 6 weeks

[c]Response format: 1 = Not at all
2 = Somewhat
3 = Mostly
4 = Completely

[d]Table entries are percentages.

"Uses humor in his approach, good stories. It's quite interesting to me that he was able to maintain the audience's attention for so long a time.

Training Presenter. Participants were also asked to evaluate the quality of the trainer, Rob Hunter, by indicating the extent that they agreed or disagreed with the statements listed in Table 3. Focusing again on the total responese for the "All Schools" section of the table, we see that for all five instructional behaviors, at least 95% of the participants either "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" that the behavior was exhibited. These are indeed high ratings to be received for a 5-day workshop; the highest agreement ratings appeared for the area of "uses good examples to illustrate points." Our observation of the training supports the reported frequency and high quality of the examples the trainer shared with the participants.

When asked for comments, the participants from all schools were in agreement and stated such positive things as the following:

"The best I've ever heard!"

"Excellent entertainer and knowledgeable in subject matter."

"Rob speaks loudly, clearly, involves the entire group. He explains things well, He's respectful to everyone. He's interested. In short, he is an excellent example of the effective teacher he is talking about."

"Trainer has done an excellent job in trying to keep the group's attention."

"The trainer has succeeded in holding the attention of a large crowd for the past four days; quite an accomplishment! He has done a fine job of giving us a very beneficial workshop."

"Though long sessions - enjoyed lecture - found it very informative."

"Very productive, refreshing from previous courses."

"Very motivating and neatly related to some of our teaching circumstances as studied in previous courses at the University."

Table 3

Participant Evaluation of Training Presenter
by School, Group and Training Time

	Group	Weeks of Training	Hooker SD	D	U	A	SA	King SD	D	U	A	SA	Sand SD	D	U	A	SA	All Schools SD	D	U	A	SA
The Trainer:																						
Clearly presents the material	T	1				9	91[a]	8	8		42	42				67	33	3	3		35	59
		6				24	76	4			32	64				32	68	2			29	69
	P	6				75	25				50	50	17			67	16		5		60	35
	A	6					100				50	50					100				17	83
	TOTAL					28	78	4	2		40	54	3			40	57	2	2		34	62
Maintains liveliness in discussion	T	1					100	8	8		67	17			17	33	50	3	3	4	35	55
		6				18	82	4			32	64				11	89	2			21	77
	P	6				25	75			11	45	44				67	33			5	47	48
	A						100					100					100					100
	TOTAL					11	89	4	2	2	45	47			3	23	74	2	1	1	23	68
Uses good examples to illustrate points	T	1					100				67	33				50	50				60	40
		6		6	23	71		4			32	64				32	68	2		2	29	67
	P					25	75				50	50				60	40				47	53
	A						100					100					100					100
	TOTAL			3	14	83		2			46	52				35	65	1		1	33	66
Responds clearly to questions	T	1				27	73	8			58	34			17	67	16	3		4	48	45
		6				18	82	5		5	36	54				42	58	2		1	33	64
	P					25	75			10	30	60				17	17	66		10	25	65
	A						100				50	50					100				17	83
	TOTAL					19	81	4		4	44	48			6	37	57	2		3	35	60
Models the described teacher behaviors	T	1				9	91		8	8	50	34				67	33		3	4	38	55
		6				24	76	4			32	64				37	63	2			31	67
	P					50	50			10	70	20			17	50	33			10	60	30
	A						100					100					100					100
	TOTAL					19	81	2	2	6	44	46			3	40	57	1	1	3	35	60

[a] Table entries are percentages.

"He is excellent - never does anything without a tie into content."

"Excellent presenter, I would not have been able to sit for so long. Rob is very supportive and a pleasure."

Only three respondents indicated any negative comments as follows:

"Speaks and gives materials too fast."

"Needs to control the audience more - common problem for adult groups."

"Too much information."

Training Content. The survey form included a section which asked participants to rate the quality of the training content areas listed in Table 4. (i.e., 1=Very Poor, 2=Poor, 3=Acceptable, 4=Good, 5=Very Good). The ratings for "All Schools" indicated that, overall, at least 85% of the participants felt that the content was "good" or "very Good." The highest rating was received in the area of "Quality of Information Presented." A variety of comments were forwarded as follows:

"The information was relatively nothing new. However, it helps to be refreshed on the topics before entering a new teaching situation."

"Excellent presentation; practical applications."

"Printing is difficult to read. Very intensive amount of material to absorb."

"Next time he should use a variety of different materials."

"There was a wealth of info which probably could have been presented in a session extending longer than 1 week."

"At times I found the sequence hard to follow but with his anticipatory sets they (it) came back pretty well."

"Due to the large group, it was difficult to see the transparencies."

Notetaking. Participants were asked to indicate if and to what extent they took notes during the sessions. Of the 113 participants responding,

Table 4

Participant Ratings of Hunter Training Content
by School, Group and Training Time

	Group	Weeks of Training	Hooker 1	2	3	4	5[a]	King 1	2	3	4	5	Sand 1	2	3	4	5	All Schools 1	2	3	4	5
Quality of the training content:	T	1				46	54[b]	8		17	33	42				17	83	3		7	35	55
		6			12	35	53			18	32	50		5	16	37	42		2	16	34	48
Use of transparencies	P	6				75	25			10	30	60			33	17	50			15	35	50
	A	6				50	50				50	50					100				33	67
	TOTAL					6	41	53	2		15	34	49		3	17	26	54	1	1	13	34	51
Time allocated to topics	T	1				9	36	55			25	33	42				33	17			14	45	41
		6				6	35	59		5	9	45	41			16	47	37		2	10	43	45
	P	6					75	25			10	20	70			17	50	33			10	40	50
	A	6					50	50				50	50				50	50				50	50
	TOTAL					5	42	53		2	15	35	48			11	57	32		1	11	44	44
Opportunity to ask questions	T	1		9	9	36	46				8	67	25			17	67	16		4	10	55	31
		6			12	12	76				18	36	46			11	26	63			14	26	60
	P	6					50	50			10	40	50			33		67			15	30	55
	A	6				50		50					100					100			17		83
	TOTAL				3	11	22	64			14	44	42			14	29	57		1	13	33	53
Sequence of topics	T	1					36	64			17	25	58			17	33				10	41	49
		6		6	6	18	70				14	36	50			21	32	47		2	14	29	55
	P	6					75	25			10	20	70			17	17	66			10	30	60
	A	6					50	50					100					100				17	83
	TOTAL				3	3	30	64			15	29	56			17	34	49		1	12	31	56
Quality of information presented	T	1					9	91	8			17	75				17	83	3			14	83
		6			6	18	76				9	32	59			5	42	53			7	31	62
	P						50	50			10	10	80			17	33	50			10	25	65
	A	6						100					100					100					100
	TOTAL					3	17	80		2		6	25	67			6	31	63	1		5	24	70

[a]Response format: 1 = Very Poor
2 = Poor
3 = Acceptable
4 = Good
5 = Very Good

[b]Table entries are percentages.

Table 5

Extent of Participant Notetaking
by School, Group and Training Time

School	Group	Weeks of Training	A few main points	A few main points and examples	Most main points and examples	Extensive notes of all points
Hooker	T	1			36	64
		6		30[a]	35	35
	P	6	25		75	
	A	6				100
	TOTAL		3	19	36	42
King	T	1	25		33	42
		6		4	64	32
	P	6	13	12	50	25
	A	6				100
	TOTAL		9	4	53	35
Sand	T	1			50	50
		6			47	53
	P	6			80	20
	A	6		50	50	
	TOTAL			3	50	47
All Schools			4	9	47	40

[a]Table entries are percentages.

Table 6

Participant Ratings of Accomplishment of Hunter Training Expectations by School, Group and Training Time[a]

School	Group	Weeks of Training	Not at All	Somewhat	Met My Expectations	More Than Expected
Hooker	T	1		18[a]	36	46
		6		18	53	29
	P	6		25	50	25
	A	6			100	
	TOTAL			19	50	
	T	1	8	8	50	34
		6		23	32	45
King	P	6		22	33	45
	A				50	50
	TOTAL		2	17	40	41
Sand	T	1		17	67	16
		6		16	53	31
	P	6		50	33	17
	A	6			50	50
	TOTAL			20	54	26
All Schools			1	19	47	33

[a]Table entries are percentages.

111 or 98% indicated that they took notes. This is an important fact in light of Rob's choice to use the overhead projector rather than handouts. Table 5 presents a breakdown of the extent of notetaking. The bottom row in the table contains the percentages of "All Schools" and indicates that 47% of the respondents took notes of "Most Main Points and Examples" and 40% felt their notes were "Extensive Notes of All Points." The two participants indicating that no notes were taken were paraprofessionals from King.

Training Outcomes. Participants were also asked to rate whether their expectations were met with respect to what they had hoped to learn during the training using the following scale: 1=Not all All, 2=Somewhat, 3=Met My Expectations, and 4=More Than Expected. Table 6 presents a breakdown of the ratings which again support the high quality of the training. At least 80% of the participating staff from each of the three schools felt that the training either met or more than met their expectations. When asked to list a few of the important things they obtained from the training, participants had little trouble coming up with several topics. A representative list of topics mentioned is as follows:

Teacher Behavior/Instruction

"Some techniques in teacher behavior in the classroom, reminders of important factors necessary for good control, insight into reasons for doing certain tasks."

"Teacher behavior, techniques for improvement of instruction."

"Some ideas to change my way of doing things in the classroom."

"I had similar training in my graduate program in Reading. This refreshed some forgotten points. Also, I found out more information about effective practice."

"Reassurance that I was doing a lot of the 'right stuff' already."

"A good specific list of components in effective lesson structure."

"Learning the proper names for different elements of reinforcement behavior, etc. we do in class, but wasn't sure of what it was labeled as."

"The awareness and importance of thoughtfully preparing lessons using the correct content and level."

"Improvement of teacher/pupil relationship. Strategies to present lesson topics and to motivate more participation out of students."

"Three categories of teacher decisions, six variables of motivation."

"Ways of keeping children focused and on task. How to set classroom tone for the school year in September."

"Reinforcement of good teaching skills and creating practices, new approach to 'old skills.'"

"Understanding of motivation and reinforcement theory."

"Student correcting techniques/"crash" review of past learnings which enabled me to bring knowledge in focus once again."

Student Behavior/Discipline

"New ideas in aiding with problem child in classroom."

"Place responsibility for child's behavior on child."

"How teacher's behavior affects the child's behavior. And what to do to moderate the teacher behavior so it will have a positive impact on the learner's behavior to moderate it."

"Discipline with dignity - teaching is a science and an art."

"Behavior management techniques."

"A good review of material I already know but hadn't thought about in awhile. Information on discipline was the most valuable."

"To deal with negative behavior on a more positive tone."

Recommendations. The final section of the survey asked participants what recommendations they would have for the training if the sessions were repeated for other school staff in the future. The recommendations will be

presented separately for the teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators.

The teacher suggestions reflected the areas of content, training time, training materials, presentation mode, and room size as follows:

Content

"To give more examples, and what to do when you are a first or second grade teacher and have to work with three or four groups of reading."

"To plan the workshop based on population, cultural background and behavior at the particular school in Hartford."

"Deal with the issues that are pertinent to a particular school/ staff, or what the school feels is a priority."

"More opportunities to design behavior strategies for changing unproductive individuals or group behavior (particularly for emotionally maladjusted students)."

Training Time

"Later, start, shorter length - 5 hours even with breaks is tough!"

"Shorter lecture periods, same teacher please."

"Lecture periods too long ... too long."

"Need more time to experience actual teaching technique." (This comment was from a 1-week teacher.)

"Shorter than 5 days - 4 days (whole days, with 1 hour lunch break)."

"Time - people felt that 8-12:00 was a better period. Attention and retention went down after 12:00."

"Shorter training sessions, smaller groups, time at end of year not productive.

"He's good - but the material is extensive for people not familiar with it - could it be spread out over time."

Training Materials

"Handouts so notetaking could be minimized and more attention given to the speaker."

"It was hard to see the overhead at times and the writing was small for those sitting a distance from the overhead."

"More films relating to principles discussed. Films relating to inner city children."

"Longer periods of time, more printed material, outlining objectives for day, philosophy, etc."

"Different materials and techniques."

Presentation Mode

"Fewer breaks, more variety. More examples of classroom application. Role play by participants. More visual and meaningful/relevant modeling materials (films)."

"Variation of presenters, group discussion."

"Smaller groups and opportunity for group participation in modeling examples."

"Too little group participation."

Room Size

"Different room with different levels. At times it was very hard to see Rob."

"Change the workshop to a better area, like an auditorium."

The paraprofessional recommendations offered were as follows:

"Further workshops."

"Shorter sessions."

"Time be shorter; 3 hours would be sufficient."

"No changes except easy on the coffee."

"More films showing teacher and students with behavioral problems."

"More variables."

"A live workshop with children in action with teacher in classroom."

The administrators also offered the following suggestions for future sessions:

"More visuals, perhaps films."

"Improving students' behavior."

"Reinforcement theory."

"Motivation."

"Smaller groups,"

"Separate administrators from teachers and have a section on evaluating classroom, teacher, student behavior."

"Strategies on how to change teacher attitudes and behavior for the administrators."

"Five hours is too long a time per session."

"Too many topics too fast - spread out with more practice for us slow learners."

"I would like an outline. I started taking notes on the second day because I did not expect the type of training we would be into."

A final question on the survey asked the 6-week participants what would be most helpful for them during the remaining 5 weeks of training. These comments were forwarded directly to Mary Wilson at the start of the 5-week session.

Conclusion: One Week Training

Together the qualitative report and the summary of the participant survey provide an in-depth assessment of the training provided by Rob Hunter. The two sources of information are in substantial agreement with one another, and provide a picture of a training program that was well-designed and implemented. Teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators were eager, although somewhat anxious, to begin the clinical part of their work at the end of the first week. They were ready to try out decision making in the three areas -- learner behavior, teacher behavior and content -- and seemed eager to do so. Rob had cautioned them against trying to implement all facets of the training, suggesting instead that

they pick one or two areas in which they wanted to work. He also reminded them that it would take time to see results and that they should give themselves that time. Part Two of this report describes and evaluates the clinical aspect of the training in which participants attempted to implement what they had learned and were involved in additional training designed to reinforce what Rob Hunter had provided.

Part Two: Clinical Component of the HESI Training

During the summer clinical experience the qualitative evaluation team spent a total of 11 days at the King School observing training and classrooms and interviewing participants and trainers. Without the full cooperation and support of all participants and project planners our work would have been difficult if not impossible. We note at the outset that staff went out of their way to accommodate to our requests. There was a feeling of camaraderie in the building which extended to include the evaluation team in the learning experience. We believe that the staff's openness and desire to share their experience is an indication of their commitment to the training, and to their assessment of it as a valuable experience.

At the end of the clinical experience, the teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators participating in the 5-week practicum completed an evaluation form entitled Summer Training Evaluation (see Appendix A). Areas addressed included training content, the training presenters, coaching, transportation logistics (paraprofessionals), and the training sessions. Recommendations for future workshops were also requested. Table 7 contains a breakdown of the number of survey respondents by school and group; a total of 78 surveys were completed at a training session during the last week of the summer program.

In order to combine these two sources of information, we organized this part of the report into two sections. The first presents the qualitative evaluation of the additional training provided during the clinical experience, followed by a summary of participants' evaluation based on the Summer Training Evaluation form. The second

section reports on the clinical experience itself based on formal interviews in which we asked about the actual classroom implementation and the coaching component. Our conclusions are based on interviews with 25 teachers, 3 administrators, 5 paraprofessionals, and 6 trainers. In this section we also present the remaining questionnaire data compiled at the end of the training and we report briefly on our observations of the parent training. Finally we summarize our findings.

Additional Training. During each of the five weeks of clinical experience teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators had additional formal training designed to reinforce and extend what they had learned during the first week with Rob Hunter. For the most part this training was well-prepared and presented and our evaluation of it conforms closely to the evaluation given by the participants.

1. Training for Administrators. This training was designed to assist principals in implementing a clinical supervision model with which they would become more skilled in working with their teachers. The content of the training reinforced that which was taught by Rob Hunter, but also dealt with the specific details of 1. managing a clinical supervision conference and 2. managing the implementation of this project in each school from September through June. The staff hired to conduct the training were experienced individuals who brought with them a wealth of insight and specific knowledge. With the exception of the session conducted by Bob Gutzman, we found the sessions to be focussed, well-paced and informative. Although there was at times a tendency for the information to become repetitive, administrators

varied in their opinion of the repetition. Most said that the repetition eventually made "it all come together" so that they understood what they were trying to do. Administrator participation varied from session to session and individual to individual. Some administrators asked many questions and made many comments; others did not. However all seemed to be attentive to the trainers and eager for the information. Administrators and teacher coaches attended many of the sessions which helped coordinate the content and process of the project.

Specific information included how to structure a clinical supervision conference; script taking while observing a classroom; techniques for stressing the positive and including the negative that one would like to change. One major emphasis for administrators was the parallel structure of the clinical supervision model with respect to the model that the teachers were implementing. Trainers pointed out that both models are the same; they merely attend to different levels in the school organization.

Another issue raised and addressed during training concerned the implementation of the Hunter model during the school year. The training session that dealt with this issue was excellent and provided principals with some guidelines on an important topic. For example, the trainer suggested that principals explain to non-participating teachers some of the concrete information that participating staff learned, and describe what they will be looking for as they observe classes in the coming year. He stressed establishing a positive feeling tone in the school and offered the possibility of working on one aspect of the model each month at a faculty meeting. He said, "You are becoming more like a

teacher and moving away from boilers, busses, and budgets. And your job next year is to teach the elements of instruction to those people who have not had the summer, and to reinforce those who were in the program." He suggested that teachers could be helpful in teaching their colleagues about what they have learned.

Another concern related to teachers' (and therefore administrators' potential difficulty in implementing the model with a class of 25 children after the experience with very small groups. Again, the message was to go slowly, provide a lot of support, and work on one thing at a time. The trainer's warning was "You can't go fast or you'll kill the whole thing." It sounds like excellent advice.

Despite the emphasis on the positive, administrators did ask for advice on dealing with marginal or perhaps imcompetent teachers. During the last day of administrative training this subject was addressed with an emphasis on the positive. Trainers stressed that the principal has a responsibility to provide help to the marginal teacher and the Hunter model coupled with clinical supervision can be a vehicle with which to deliver that help. Trainers recognized that not all help with be successful and spent some time reminding principals how to keep adequate records of the help they provided and the teacher's responses.

Administrative training concluded with new information and with a pep talk. Carole Helstrom, who coordinated the trainers for the clinical experience, met with the principals and told them how much they had accomplished and how skeptical she had been at the prospect of the six week training project. Now, at the end of the experience, she believes it has been effective. Her words serve as a fitting conclusion

to this section:

> You have established a team approach with your faculty. We have pushed the positive side of the project, positive reinforcement for teachers, but this program is not pablum. You have to establish positive relationships in order to establish positive communication with teachers in order to have the communications to talk about teaching. Teachers need to be told they are doing well. And they need a way to talk about what works. They need to know what we know about teaching and how to talk about it.

These principals, according to Carole, had accomplished enough to foster those necessary communications in their buildings. From our perspective on the training, her assessment seems quite accurate.

2. Training for Teachers. The afternoon training sessions designed for teachers in particular were also attended by administrators and para-professionals. Our conclusions about this training are based on observations of segments of the training and on interviews with participants. On the whole, the training sessions were good. They tended to review prior teachings -- a reasonable focus given the wealth of information that had been communicated during the first week of training -- and participants reported gaining useful information from them.

With respect to the question of review, some teachers (one third of those interviewed) reported that too much of the training material presented in the clinical experience repeated Hunter's content. They suggested that the trainers relied not only on the content of the Hunter model, but on the same jokes and examples. Having observed segments of the training, we concur with the general sentiment. There was similarity in the content, and one trainer in particular appeared to be a pale copy of Rob Hunter. However, for the most part trainers had their own styles, and the repetition was not necessarily a disadvantage.

Staff were just beginning to try out the techniques in their classrooms and most indicated that they benefitted from the review.

We would evaluate the trainers as good to very good, with only one exception. (Participants' ratings on the evaluation form are in agreement with our judgments.) The high quality sessions might have been improved had the trainers provided an opportunity for staff to engage in dialogue with them. The large size of the group and of the auditorium in which the sessions were held, however, precluded such an exchange. Trainers did encourage questions from the participants. The following descriptions provide samples of the material to which participants were exposed in the additional training sessions.

Faye Parmalee's session detailed task analysis beginning with a review of the steps necessary in giving clear teaching directions. She listed ten steps: 1. signalling to get the students' attention, 2. knowing the objective and purpose of the lesson, 3. giving the directions, 4. checking for understanding, 5. modeling behavior if appropriate, 6. practicing the lesson in parts, 7. checking for understanding again, 8. practicing the whole lesson, and 10. giving a clear signal to begin. This was followed by a segment on task analysis: 1. formulating the objective(s), 2. clarifying the objective (what it means and what the teacher wants students to do), 3. listing the essential components en route to the objective, and 4. putting the essential components in sequence. The information was presented clearly and participants received handouts in addition to the notes that they took.

Although a great deal of material was presented in a short time, participants did not seem to feel rushed. Some, however, needed additional clarification on the process of eliminating components that might not be essential to teaching a particular objective. The discussion of this important issue was somewhat confused, with the trainer suggesting that the outcome of the decision process was less important than engaging in the process of thinking about what needs to be taught in order to reach a particular objective. It is a significant indicator of participants' involvement with the training content that they are pursuing further clarification. It might be useful to include additional training on this topic and on task analysis in general during the coming academic year.

As another example, Bill Bircher's session on anticipatory set, teaching to an objective and the need to add meaning to the content so that students are motivated to learn as well-organized, fast-paced and full of useful classroom examples and practical suggestions. This trainer was particularly responsive to participants' questions and modeled the Hunter model very well.

Summary: Additional Training.

The additional training provided participants with yet other occasions on which to hear and use the Hunter vocabulary. Repetition, perhaps tedious on occasion, might be thought of as the "massed practice" recommended by the model for mastering new learning. Several teachers and one administrator indicated that by the fourth week of practice and training, they realized that they were beginning to feel more at ease with both the vocabulary and the meaning of the ideas. Certainly

this is an important outcome of the training project.

Our major concern with respect to the additional training relates to two issues: 1. a caution with respect to the project's emphasis on the positive, and 2. the role of the paraprofessionals.

1. Throughout training trainers emphasized the need to stress the positive aspects of teachers' efforts. This is a worthwhile endeavor, but raises a potential problem that needs to be mentioned with respect to administrators' as well as teachers' work. Positive reinforcement alone will not improve the quality of what goes on in a classroom; although as suggested during training, it can help set a tone and a relationship in which teachers and principals can work together to improve teaching. Little if any attention however was paid to curriculum -- clearly one of the areas of teacher decision making -- an area which will ultimately influence the quality of children's learning. This separation of the form of teaching from content emerged from time to time when principals raised the issue of how to deal with a teacher who might be doing all of the things Hunter suggested as far as form is concerned but who still might not be teaching much to the children. It was raised as a serious question, but was not adequately addressed during the specific training that we observed. Answers stressed the supervisory nature of the clinical supervision conference rather than its evaluative possibilities. This begs the issue which is a serious one for both teachers and administrators.

2. Although required to attend the training, it was not always clear to paraprofessionals that it was specific to their jobs. Trainers were not likely to use examples of paraprofessionals working with

teachers or children in their lectures; some paraprofessionals worked closely with individual or groups of children; others said they did not. The actual work of a paraprofessional seemed to vary as a function of the paraprofessionals' skills and interests and the preferences of the classroom teacher. Those paraprofessionals who found the training salient were 1. those who do work closely with children and 2. those who were enrolled in college courses and hope to earn their teaching certificate. Others wondered why there were there. In future training, and during the year, it would be helpful to articulate more clearly the purpose of training for paraprofessionals.

We note in this respect that one training session was held specifically for paraprofessionals and addressed the question: What does all of this have to do with me? The objective of the session was to bridge the gap between the teachers's training and the paraprofessionals' job. The training was well-implemented by Faye Parmalee who modeled effective teaching techniques as she focused in part on four principles: 1. monitoring and adjusting; 2. using the principals of learning, 3. selecting learning at the correct level of difficulty, and, 4. teaching to the intended objectives. This session was a good start toward exploring the role of the paraprofessional and the specific ways in which they can use the training in their work in schools.

3. Summer Training Evaluation Form. With respect to Training Content, participants were asked to rate the extent that they felt the objectives of the training sessions were achieved using the following scale: 1=Not at all, 2=Somewhat, 3=Mostly, 4=Completely. Table 8 contains a breakdown of the response percentages by school and group.

Table 7

Number of Five-Week Summer Training Survey Respondents by School and Group

Group	School			Total
	Hooker	King	Sand	
Teachers	20	22	19	61
Paraprofessionals	3	7	4	15
Administrators*	2			2
TOTAL	25	29	23	78

*Due to their involvement in a meeting, the administrators from King and Sand were not present when evaluation forms were distributed. The evaluator failed to follow-up obtaining surveys from these administrators. We note that their views are reflected in the report as a result of formal qualitative interviews.

Table 8

Participant Ratings of Accomplishment of Five-Week Summer Training Objectives by School and Group

Objectives	Group[a]	Hooker 1	2	3	4[b]	King 1	2	3	4	Sand 1	2	3	4	All Schools 1	2	3	4
Participants will be able to:																	
Carol Helstrom																	
1. Identify the classroom responsibilities of the teacher	T			30	70[c]	4		36	60		5	32	63	2	2	34	62
	P			67	33			33	67		25	50	25		7	50	43
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL			36	64	4		36	60		9	35	56	1	3	37	59
2. List and define the essential elements of instruction	T			30	70	4		23	73			21	79	2		25	73
	P	33		33	34			33	67			75	25		7	43	50
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL	4		32	64	4		25	71			30	70	1	1	30	68
3. Teach to an objective	T			30	70	5		27	68		5	26	69	2	1	29	68
	P			33	67			33	67			50	50			36	64
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL			32	68	4		28	68		4	31	65	1	1	31	67
Robert Gutzman																	
4. Use the principles of learning	T	5		58	37		9	41	50		26	37	37		15	44	41
	P			100			17	33	50			100			14	64	22
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL	4		63	23		11	39	50		22	48	30		14	48	38
5. Effectively use the tools of teaching	T	26		48	26		9	50	41	11	16	47	26	3	17	49	31
	P			67	33			40	60		25	75			15	54	31
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL	21		50	29		7	48	45	9	17	52	22	3	16	50	31
6. Monitor learning and adjust teaching when necessary	T	16		42	42		14	33	53	11	10	53	26	3	15	42	40
	P			100				20	80		25	75			8	61	31
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL	13		50	37		12	31	57	9	13	56	22	3	13	45	39
7. Effectively employ knowledge about learning to increase student success	T	21		42	37		24	29	47	6	17	44	33	2	20	39	39
	P			67	33			20	80		25	75			8	54	38
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL	17		46	37		19	27	54	5	18	50	27	1	18	42	39
Faye Parmelee																	
8. Use the principles of learning	T			40	60		5	38	57		11	37	52		5	39	56
	P	33		67				50	50		25	75			14	57	29
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL	4		44	52		4	41	55		13	44	43		6	43	51

Table 8 (cont.)

Objectives	Group[a]	Hooker[b] 1	2	3	4	King 1	2	3	4	Sand 1	2	3	4	All Schools 1	2	3	4
9. Effectively use the tools of teaching	T		5	53	42[c]			45	55		10	53	37		5	51	44
	P		33	67				33	67			100			7	64	29
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL		8	54	38			42	58		9	61	30		5	53	42
10. Design a plan to elicit productive student behavior	T		5	45	50		5	48	47	5		47	48	2	5	46	47
	P		33	33	34		17	17	66			75	25		14	43	43
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL		8	44	48		7	41	52	4		52	44	1	7	45	47
William Bircher/John Del Grego																	
11. Use the components of lesson design	T		10	35	55			9	91		5	37	58		5	26	69
	P			100				40	60		23	50	25		8	61	31
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL		8	44	48			15	85		9	39	52		5	33	52
12. Use the principles of learning	T		5	42	53			32	68		6	33	61		3	36	61
	P			100				25	75			50	50			58	42
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL		4	50	46			31	69		5	36	59		3	40	57
13. Use the tools of teaching	T		11	42	47		9	14	77	5		42	53	2	7	31	60
	P			67	33			50	50			50	50			58	42
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL		8	46	46		8	19	73	4		44	52	1	5	37	57
Carole Helstrom																	
14. Understand the relationship between instructional skills and classroom management strategies	T		5	32	63		14	23	63			47	53		6	33	61
	P			67	33			20	80		25	50	25		8	38	54
	A			50	50											50	50
	TOTAL		4	38	58		11	22	67		4	48	48		7	34	59
15. Design a plan to implement components of the model during the 1984-1985 year	T		5	43	52		5	21	74		5	53	42		5	40	55
	P			67	33			25	75	25		50	25	8		50	42
	A			100												100	
	TOTAL		4	50	46		4	22	74	5	4	52	39	1	4	43	52

[a]Groups: T = Teacher
P = Paraprofessional
A = Administrator

[b]Response Format: 1 = Not at all
2 = Somewhat
3 = Mostly
4 = Completely

[c]Table entries are percentages

Note that the training presenters for each set of objectives are also listed. Readers should first focus on the percentages listed in the far right column labeled "All Schools." The percentages enclosed in the box under "All Schools" represent the ratings of all respondents for each objective. Readers may also wish to further examine the ratings for individual groups (teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators) or schools. The "Total" percentages for "All Schools" were clearly supportive of the training efforts in that for 11/15 objectives at least 92% of the participants felt the objectives were either "Mostly" or "Completely Achieved." For the remaining four objectives (i.e., #4-7), at least 81% of the respondents felt this was the case. Inspection of the ratings by school and participant group suggests that no major differences of opinion were present among the schools or groups.

Training Presenters. The quality of the training presentations was evaluated by asking participants the extent that they agreed or disagreed with the statements listed in Table 9. The evaluations suggest that the participants felt that the highest quality presentations were made by John Del Grego and Carole Helstrom. Lower ratings and more varied opinions were present for Robert Gutzman, especially in the area of "maintaining liveliness in discussions." Overall, the presenters are to be commended for their quality presentation styles: HESI administrators are also to be commended for their selections of the particular trainers.

The Clinical Experience

Staff members had a unique opportunity during the clinical segment of the training to try out aspects of the Hunter model. In addition,

Table 9

Participant Ratings of the Quality of the
Five-Week Summer Institute

Topic	Carol Helmstrom					Robert Gutzman					Faye Parmelee					William Bircher					John Del Grego				
	SD	D	U	A	SA[a]	SD	D	U	A	SA	SD	D	U	A	SA	SD	D	U	A	SA	SD	D	U	A	SA
Clearly presented the material	1		1	50	48	3	12	15	47	23		3	9	52	36			5	54	41			1	32	67
Maintained liveliness in discussion	1	1	4	34	60	14	16	17	41	12	1	7	14	56	22		5	11	55	29				28	72
Used good examples to illustrate points	1			45	54	3	11	17	47	22		5	3	58	34		1	10	51	37			1	31	68
Responded clearly to questions		1	5	40	54	4	7	14	50	25	3	4	8	49	36	1	3	11	46	39			2	32	66

[a]Response format: SD = Strong Disagree
D = Disagree
U = Undecided
A = Agree
SA = Strongly Agree

due to the concurrent training of principals in clinical supervision, there was an opportunity for teachers to get feedback on what they were doing, and perhaps more importantly, for teachers and principals to build a supportive, constructive relationship in which they could work together to improve classroom instruction. We emphasize that all teachers and administrators indicated that they had indeed improved their ability to work with each other with respect to instructional issues. Teachers and administrators said that they felt they were working together supportively and with greater focus than had been the case prior to training. They found the common language beneficial and applauded the opportunity to engage in the learning together. Teachers and principals appreciated the presence of their coaches; several teachers wished that their coaching was as intensive as that of the principals. Perhaps most important as a long-term impact, teachers did not feel threatened by their principals' observations. Indeed, most welcomed them. It would serve the project (and the students of Hartford) well to maintain this emphasis on collaborative growth for improved teaching, supervision, and of course, student learning during the academic year.

Although the clinical component was excellent, staff members did report several issues that concerned them. We list them here in the spirit of improving what was an excellent format and experience. We present the findings for all participants rather than school by school because responses were similar regardless of the specific school. First, some teachers found themselves without the teaching supplies they had requested. We do not know what the logistical problems were, but teachers interviewed would have appreciated having their supplies and

equipment at the start of the five week teaching period.

Second, more than half of the teachers would have liked slightly larger class sizes. Fifteen children might have been assigned to a classroom, but often no more than 8-10 were actually in class. With two teachers and an aide in the room, teachers felt they did not have a large enough teacher/pupil ratio to try out the Hunter techniques in a real school setting. We noted observing one class in which there were in a room at one point 9 children, two teachers, one paraprofessional, two principals and a principal coach. The adults came close to out-numbering the children! Despite this teacher concern, we would argue that small class sizes, even if a few were too small, did allow teachers to work on their own learning with greater attention than would have been possible had they had larger classes.

Third, approximately one third of the teachers said that they would have liked something more than positive reinforcement from their coaches. They appreciated the emphasis on the positive, but began to wonder why no one was telling them how to improve further. There was a strong emphasis in the design of this project on fostering a positive climate in which teachers could in fact be open to suggestions about improvement. The fact that some would have liked to hear about their weaknesses during the summer, although mentioned as a concern, should also be taken as an indicator of success with the positive approach. Certainly there is time in the academic years ahead to gently guide teachers into improving aspects of their work.

We include now an overview of teachers', principals' and paraprofessionals' descriptions and evaluations of the implementation

of their learning during the clinical experience. It is an extraordinarily positive report, and should be read keeping in mind the enduring sense of enthusiasm and excitement that permeated the King School during these five weeks. Teachers and principals looked enthusiastic as they went about the school. They appeared to be enjoying their work; not a small indicator of success in a program that took teachers and principals immediately from the end of the school year and placed them once again in classrooms and corridors.

Implementing the Model: Results from Summer Training Evaluation Form

Coaching. The summer institute coaching activities were evaluated by teachers and administrators. Teacher responses are listed in Table 10. Included are the questions asked of teachers and the percentage of teachers responding "yes" to each question. When asked if they and their team member observed and then coached each other, all Hooker respondents, 85% (18/21) of the King teachers, and 90% (17/19) of the Sand teachers indicated this activity took place. Those teachers responding yes indicated that the number of times such coaching took place over the five week period ranged from 1 to 20; two teachers listed "several times" and 21 teachers listed "all the time." All respondents except for one Hooker teacher indicated that they were observed by their teacher coach. The frequency of such observations over the five week period ranged from 1 to 20 with 70% of the teachers indicating two or three observations were made by the teacher coach. All respondents, except for one King teacher, felt that the follow-up conference with the teacher coach was helpful. When asked for their comments, several teachers offered observations about the coaching activity; a few

Table 10

Teacher Description of Summer Institute Activities and Instructional Materials

Question	Hooker Yes	King Yes	Sand Yes	All Schools Yes
Did you and your team member(s) observe and then coach each other?	100[a]	86	90	90
Were you observed by your teacher coach?	95	100	100	98
Was the follow-up conference with the teacher coach helpful?	100	95	100	98
Were you observed by a principal team?	100	91	100	97
Was the follow-up conference with the principal team helpful?	94	94	84	91
Did you have adequate teaching materials and equipment?	78	85	53	72

[a]Table entries are percentages.

teachers (N=4) requested additional personnel and activities in this area. The comments were as follows:

Observations

"Very good conference."

"Were able to share and clearly understand certain use."

"She was always positive; she gave specific examples for everything."

"The conference was always very positive and encouraging. We were able to discuss the program and any concerns."

"The coach knew the same that I knew about this program."

"Great relationship between teachers-coach."

Personnel/Activities

"It would have been much more effective had each school been assigned at least two coaches which would have enabled that coach to observe and conference more."

"Excellent point of reference = teacher coach. More teacher coaches needed as teams wanted every other day observations."

"Not enough observation."

"Need more feedback on improving teaching skills."

Teachers were also asked about the observations by principals. Except for two King teachers, all teachers indicated that they had been observed by the principal team. While one Sand teacher noted he/she had been observed 20 times over the 5-week period, the remaining teachers indicated that from one to four observations took place with the most frequent number being either one or two times. Teachers were asked if the follow-up conference with the principal team was helpful. Ninety-one percent (91%, 50/55) of the teachers responding felt the sessions were helpful. Comments offered by respondents

were as follows:

"They were positive and always gave specific examples."

"More observations-formal and informal-are needed."

"I did not value this conference as much as the ones with the teacher coach because the principals are training too and were practicing on us."

"Very good follow-up conference."

"We should ask for suggestions on improvement."

"Need more feedback on improving teaching skills."

"Good communication between teacher-administrators."

Finally, the teachers were asked if they had adequate teaching materials and equipment. Overall, only 72% of the respondents responded "yes," with the lowest percentage of affirmative responses coming from the Sand teachers (53%). When asked to comment, only one teacher recorded a positive statement of "Great!" while the remaining comments were as follows:

"Had to search for staplers, chalk, board erasers, scissors, paint, paint brushes."

"Short of materials."

"Short of materials, material ordered never arrived."

"Publisher's materials fell through at the last minute. Classroom instructional supplies (i.e., math paper) not available.

"We asked for specific materials before we started the program and we didn't receive it."

"Yes, from our classroom."

"We made do without math paper for a long time. Orders for supplies were slow in coming, but we adapted."

"We had to make plenty of teacher made materials."

"They were all teacher made material. Had to spend extra money for materials."

"Clear plastic and pens for overhead were needed sooner. Ordered materials should have been here sooner."

"Had to supply own classroom materials and books after program started."

"Not all materials requested were received."

"They were all teacher designed."

"Did not get what we ordered - a reading program - but my teacher went to the library frequently to get reading materials not provided by HESI."

Principals and vice-principals were also asked to respond to questions regarding coaching activities listed in Table 11. The three respondents from Hooker and King indicated that their coach was always with them during the post-observation conference with teachers; the two Hooker administrators disagreed as to whether the conference was helpful. Comments offered were as follows:

"Extremely helpful, since he immediately conferenced with us on our conferences providing us with the positive things we did and recommendations for improvement."

"It was not only helpful and profitable, but vital as well."

Paraprofessionals from Sand and Hooker were asked if riding the bus each day with students to and from King at lunch time interferred with their involvement in any training activities. Of the Hooker paraprofessionals who responded, 2/3 or 67%, felt it was a problem; only 1/3 or 33% of the Sand respondents noted a problem. Comments offered were as follows:

"Travel time between Hooker and King prevented me from making the 12:15 beginning time on Wednesdays. Lunch time was hasty because of time factor; but again, only on Wednesday."

"Not always having means of transportation that would allow returning to King in time to begin training activities was a problem."

Table 11

Principal/Vice-Principal Description
of Summer Institute Coaching Activity

Question	School[a]	All the Time	About Half the Time	Less Than Half Time	Yes
How often was your coach with you during your post-observation conference with teachers?	Hooker[b]	100[c]			
	King	100			
	TOTAL	100			
In general, was the coach's participation helpful during the conference?	Hooker				50
	King				100
	TOTAL				67
Following the teacher conference you met with your coach. In general, was this meeting helpful?	Hooker				50
	King				100
	TOTAL				67

[a]No surveys were received from Sand.

[b]Hooker, N=2
King, N=1

[c]Table entries are percentages.

"Because I cannot attend all the conference because of the distance from Hooker to King."

Training Sessions. Participants were asked if they thought the length of the 5-week clinical training was "Too Short, " "Just Right," or "Too Long" (see Table 12). The majority (59%) of respondents felt that the training was "Just Right," while 36% felt it was "Too Long." Among the three schools, the participants most satisfied with the 5-week length were from King. Almost half (48%) of the Hooker teachers and 41% of the Sand teachers felt the training was too long. When asked to comment, the statements generally reflected the feeling that the program should be reduced by one week. The Hooker and Sand teachers offered several comments as follows:

Hooker

"Four weeks should be sufficient."

"After being saturated during the first week with Robin Hunter, I felt that there has been too many lectures presenting the same material. I feel 4 weeks would have been sufficient."

"Four weeks would have been more than enough. A five week program (including the week or training) would have been enough."

"Too much in a very intensive period. However, much was accomplished on my part."

"I think four weeks with the students would have been sufficient."

"Four weeks would have been best; but, of course, the $ is a motivation."

"I think the only reason 5 weeks was a little hard was because we just finished school and we're a little tired. But, I think the 5 weeks are necessary."

Sand

"Too long for so few children to work with."

"First week - too much too soon."

Table 12

Participant Evaluation of Length of Five-Week Training

Question	School	Too Short	Just Right	Too Long
What is your opinion of the length of the 5-week clinical training?	Hooker		52	48
	King	14[a]	72	14
	Sand		59	41
	TOTAL	5	59	36

[a]Table entries are percentages

"I believe the program should have ended the end of July instead of the beginning of August. Five weeks (total), 4 with students, would be sufficient."

The final question asked participants to offer recommendations for changing future HESI training sessions. Several suggestions were forwarded by teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators. The teacher suggestions generally reflected the areas of general planning and logistics, materials, training time, students, coaching, presenters, and program content. The paraprofessional suggestions pertained mostly to program logistics. We have included these comments in Appendix B.

Implementing the Model. Results from Formal Interviews

1. Stressing Positive Reinforcement and Positive Feeling Tone. Virtually all of the teachers with whom we spoke indicated that they were trying to provide positive reinforcement and to create a positive feeling tone in their classrooms. One experienced teacher, for example said, "I'm working on praise. I had a habit of being critical." This teacher is also re-thinking his reliance on extrinsic reinforcement -- candy and stickers -- in light of Hunter's emphasis on developing intrinsic motivation in students, and on his ability to influence the feeling tone of the classroom. He noted "I used to come in sometimes in the morning irritated and angry and I'd let the kids know. I thought I was giving them fair warning, but I wasn't thinking about the kind of atmosphere that set. It never occurred to me that it set a certain mood that would last for the whole day." The training had led this teacher and others to re-think and in some instances change their ways of interacting with students.

It has done the same thing for principals who are now stressing

the positive with their teachers. Said one principal, "I am doing away with the negative and looking for the positive. That's for developing rapport at this stage of the game. I don't want to frighten anyone off. I want to set the tone and tell the teachers that I am just another trainee along with them and my assistant principal is writing about what's wrong with me."

Paraprofessionals also reported new attention to the positive. Said one, "I no longer tell children they are wrong if they are wrong. I ask them to try again and I try to make more of an effort to see if they understand what they are doing." Said another, "Before you would say, 'how come you don't have the work done?' Now I say, 'Are you having any trouble? Let's see how we can work it out?' And you don't get as angry or as frustrated."

2. Working on More Focussed Teaching. Some teachers had chosen to work on improving the extent to which they 1. teach to objectives, and 2. use questioning. One teacher in particular said he was now more aware of his tendency to "fly off on tangents" while teaching, and was working hard to stay with the objective. Another said he realized that he usually "lets kids off the hook" by calling only on those who raised their hands. As a result of training, he is more aware of the need to include all children in questioning activities.

3. Emphasis on Level of Concern. For several of the teachers, level of student involvement and commitment to the particular learning objective became an important issue. They worked on ways to make material meaningful to students and on ways to maintain student concern throughout a lesson. Unfortunately, teachers emphasizing this issue were unable to provide any details on their approach to this topic at the time of

the interview which was early in the clinical segment of the project.

One teacher, however, articulated an important aspect of level of concern with respect to teachers rather than students. She revealed that two things were most important to her in the HESI training. One was the quality of Rob Hunter's training. The other was the visible support for teachers implicit in the program and explicit in the presence of central office staff at the training and at the clinical experience. The Superintendent's commitment to the project, the involvement of high quality trainers, gave this teacher the sense that teachers are important and will be supported by the system. The symbolic meaning of HESI should not be overlooked as this teacher has significantly indicated.

4. Lesson Design. Although most of the teachers with whom we spoke reported attending to positive reinforcement, two or three indicated that they were trying to develop lessons that included the seven design principals that Rob Hunter had outlined. They felt that the seven principals helped them to structure better lessons. "Before, I used to pick bits and pieces of lesson design that I knew about from handouts that the principal had given us. But I never went through it in sequence in order to feel comfortable with it. My goal this summer is to start working on lesson design; to start lessons, to go through the sequence and finish and be comfortable with the process." When asked why she had chosen this emphasis, the teacher replied, "Because I see that it works. It doesn't leave a lot of room for failure, because you are constantly checking for failure and re-teaching what some of the kids have missed."

Two teachers who were enjoying the teaming experience were also

working on aspects of lesson design. "We have been trying to gear our lessons to include at least a few aspects (of the model): how we are starting and ending, anticipatory set, closure and guided practice ... And now we're quizzing the kids at the end, and you see that they've learned it." For these teachers, and for most others, lesson design provides a structure that helps them teach and monitor children's progress simultaneously. Surely their endorsement is an indication of the value of the training and its salience to teachers.

5. Becoming Aware of Teaching Decisions. Without diminishing their enthusiasm for the training and clinical experience, most teachers indicated that much of what they had learned they knew before. As a result of training, however, they were now able to label what they were doing, and talk about it to others. For a small number of teachers, attention to the labeling, to self-reflection with respect to teaching, was where they focused their attention during the clinical experience. Although this might not have resulted in their working on a particular aspect of Hunter's model, this kind of reflection is a positive outcome of the training, and one that should not be minimized. As one teacher said, "this training has given me a language to talk to other people about teaching. I feel more like a professional, more like I know something, because of that." A teacher from another school shared her sentiments. She said, "I want to internalize this (model) and I want to be able to articulate what it is that I am doing." Yet another teacher who had some previous exposure to the model was able to describe many ways in which it has made a difference in her teaching:

I've been aware of calling on people, on everyone. I used to be quick to say "no," now I prompt or tell kids that I'll come back to them and ask another kid a similar question. I really try all parts of the Hunter model. Anticipatory set, guided practice... Some things I had never heard of such as dignifying a wrong response, or calling on as many kids as possible, or signaling. Asking different types of questions is another new thing... Now I'm more aware of Bloom's taxonomy and I try to use that with questions. I try to stretch them to higher levels... With anticipatory set, I always started with motivation, and I used to have morning work, but it wasn't mind expanding and now it wakes their brain up... I'm more creative in my motivation and I understand the need for it. I'm more aware of the importance of modeling, using the overhead and using the blackboard and helping the right hemisphere. I'm kind of a visual person myself, and now I understand the importance of doing this.

6. Teachers Teaming and Coaching Each Other. In most instances, teaching with a colleague in the room was a new experience for teachers. Four with whom we spoke were explicit in saying that they would not choose to work with another teacher if they had the choice. They described themselves as "loners." However, even these individuals joined the majority in finding the teaming productive because it allowed them to watch another professional and taught them to plan for a teaching day with another teacher. (Teachers who were new to teaming indicated that they did not know how to include and plan with the paraprofessional. They felt that they had enough to do planning with each other and that responsibility for the paraprofessional was too much. This concern, and the paraprofessional's uncertain sense of purpose was confirmed in the evaluation form, comments section.)

From our interviews, we have concluded that placing two teachers in a room, even when they had chosen each other, did not necessarily lead to activity that we would call "coaching." Most often it led to their observing one another, evaluating activities and planning together. For example, one teacher said of coaching, "You get to sit down and

watch each other, and the teaching load isn't always on you. We exchanged ideas, and in September we plan to exchange classes and do some things together." Another said, "I am uncomfortable critiqueing my colleague." We suspect that she spoke for many who shied away from this activity. Still another said that he and his co-teacher "go over lessons each day in the morning before the children come and review what happened yesterday with the kids -- what went well and what didn't go well." They do not talk about their own teaching techniques and aspects of Hunter that they are trying to incorporate. Despite their initial reluctance to team, none of the teachers with whom we spoke disliked the arrangement; on the contrary, most seemed to enjoy the company of another teacher in the room.

Teachers did, however, indicate overwhelmingly on the evaluation form that they coached each other. Our interpretation of this response which differs from the interview data, is that teachers used the word "coached" broadly, to mean conversations that related to classroom planning or evaluation of on-going and proposed activities as well as conversations that explicitly dealt with teaching techniques and strategies. We are using the word more narrowly. It is possible that the project may not have clearly defined what it envisioned as "teachers coaching each other, which led to this difference in conclusion.

7. Role of the Teacher Coach. Most of the teachers with whom we spoke found the teacher coaches helpful in providing positive feedback that encouraged them to continue to implement aspects of

the Hunter model. Only once did we hear that a coach was unable to be helpful, and this was from a teacher who objected to the coach's lack of elementary school teaching experience. It was not clear from the examples she gave whether elementary school experience would have solved the problem; there seemed to have been a difference in pedadogical style.

All of the coaches were reported to be helpful in continually using the language, the terminology and thereby helping teachers to internalize it. The coaches' use of language also helped teachers to learn how to label their own classroom actions. For example, a coach might describe the anticipatory set that she saw the teacher use. The teacher then could more readily attach that label to a specific part of the lesson. Said one teacher, "She goes over lessons, asks us how we are using the lesson design and offers constructive criticism on how the lesson went. She has been very helpful. She offers another side as an observer."

8. Principal Role in Conferencing. Although a few teachers indicated that they saw no difference in the way in which their principals handled the supervisory conference, they were in the distinct minority. Most found the difference dramatic and positive. Said one teacher, "They never conferenced before! Never! They popped in and out of class, but never gave any feedback. We knew that he knew who was good, but he never said. This is the first time he's ever talked to me about what I do in the classroom." This teacher appreciated the new focus. So did another who said that principals now "focus on positive teacher behavior, on a good feeling tone and on positive feedback.

They give labels to what you are doing. I feel good after the conference. We have longer conferences with the principal than with the teacher coach -- about 20 minutes."

This teacher went on to suggest that one of the reasons for teachers' positive experience with the conference is also a result of the conference not going into the teacher's permanent file. It is easier to have open communication when the teacher's permanent record is not on the line.

Interestingly, teachers also commented that they believed that principals were enjoying the conferencing. Said one, "The principals seemed to be enjoying it more also. They said that they were learning too and were nervous about being watched by their coach. They were also being observed and it was really good that they told us that." This statement, the sentiment of many teachers, provides additional support for the HESI training design that included teachers, paraprofessionals and principals. The design has helped create the feeling that improvement is a school-wide understanding in which all staff members will improve themselves and help to improve each other.

Principals talked about the increased detail in their confreences, and confirmed teachers' descriptions of the positive focus of the conferences. One assistant principal explained the rationale for emphasizing the positive, revealing the similarity between teacher and principal training. Teachers are emphasizing the positive with children; principals are doing the same with teachers, "because in that way, they'll go back and do more of it." He continued by saying that there was a clear decision not to make any suggestions to teachers as to how they could improve. Although this aspect of supervision is important,

it was excluded during the summer experience "strictly to keep people from feeling turned off by the training. We did not want them to feel that we were harrassing them with these clinical supervisions." Teachers comments, reported above, confirm the wisdom of this decision.

9. Principals' Use of Script Taking. Principals all indicated that they were studiously working on developing their ability to write down all of the dialogue that occurs during the times in which they are observing teaching. They reported that they were able then to use the scripts as a basis for making decisions about how to focus the supervisory conference. Teachers reported never having had conferences before HESI in which principals were able to be so explicit about what they had seen and heard in the classroom.

When script taking, one principal indicated that he "looks for principles of learning, the parts of lesson design -- when and how they were used -- the level of difficulty and whether it was appropriate, teaching to the objective, whether the examples are relevant, did the teacher check for understanding, did children meet with success, and did the teacher accomplish his or her objectives." It is a sign of project success that this principal, who was unfamiliar with Hunter and with clinical supervision can now list so many aspects of teaching with ease. He laughed when reflecting on the characteristics of his conferences with teachers in previous years, noting that he would say "you have a nice interest center in the room, the climate is nice, and I noticed that 8 or 9 children were not engaged in learning." For him, the ability to know, and therefore notice more has been a positive experience.

One of the other principals had similar remarks, and added that clinical supervision provided a way for him to be more visible in the school and more involved with instruction. Prior to the training, he was not sure how to accomplish increased visibility and involvement. As a result of training he "can now see that clinical supervision makes so much sense as a way of providing instructional leadership." He feels that prior to training he was "scattershot" in his conferences. To use his words, now he is more "rifleshot," and considers this a significant improvement. Teachers in his school confirm the change in his conferencing technique. Reported one, "He has always been a narrative observer and he always has a sheet with things that you said and anecdotal things about what you did. The difference now is he's taking specifics of what you are saying and targeting in on one aspect of the model. Now he has a structure."

10. Lack of Implementation. Despite overwhelming enthusiasm for trying out parts of Hunter's model, we did encounter teachers (2 or 3) who were either uncertain about how to implement the model, or who felt it offered little worth trying. We did not work closely with teachers and so do not know the source of the uncertainty, or the explanation for why some teachers saw little connection between training and classroom teaching. Said one such teacher, "I don't know about trying the model. I'm not too familiar with the terminology of the Hunter model. Before I was (already) teaching, and now the terminology is being applied to what I do. I haven't memorized it. I know I'm teaching along seven or eight areas of lesson design. I was never

applying any of the terms. I'm not doing anything differently now as before. I'm doing basically the same thing." This teacher was not hostile to the training or the project. We can only conclude that any training program, even one as relevant and well-implemented as this, will be unconvincing or of minimal interest or impact to some participants. We suggest that attention focus on the many teachers who found the training and the clinical experience worthwhile, compelling, and even fun.

11. Parent Training. On the mornings of July 9, 10, 11 and 12, parents from Sand, King and Hooker were bussed to the AETNA Institute to participate in the parent training component of HESI. Parents were divided into school groups, each of which had a facilitator. During the next four days parents heard their principals describe their school's mission, worked on defining their role with respect to the school, and worked toward developing action plans that addressed their areas of concern.

As part of the evaluation process, we attended one parent training group on the second morning of training. The facilitator in charge encouraged all parents to speak during the session, and the discussion was lively. Parents sounded eager to talk about the school and their role in it. Brief conversations with parents on the bus returning to King after the training revealed that those in other groups found the sessions stimulating and enjoyed talking with parents whom they had not previously met. (Many parents did know one another; but some attending had come without knowing anyone else involved.)

It was also clear from conversations on the bus, that some parents

brought to the training sessions specific problems that they wanted addressed. At the end of the summer training, we are unclear as to how or whether the project is organized to deal with specific parent concerns. Further attention should be devoted to defining the purpose of parent training, and parents' relation to the rest of the HESI project as the school year begins.

Summary: The Clinical Experience. There is no question that teachers and administrators were implementing aspects of the Hunter model and that they found this a worthwhile endeavor. Their facility with the language and ideas is assuredly a result of the training. When we interviewed staff members during the Planning Phase of the project, with the exception of several teachers at Sand, they were unfamiliar with the Hunter model and did not use the vocabulary when speaking about their teaching. Now, only two months later, they have the vocabulary, the ideas, and the belief that they have teaching and supervisory skills that will improve their work with children. This is a substantial accomplishment for the HESI project.

Both teachers and administrators now wonder what will happen as they try to implement these skills with larger groups of children in the regular school setting. Principals wonder how they will find time for the supervisory conferences and how they will combine their supervisory and evaluation responsibilities without losing the positive climate that was forged during the summer. Teachers wonder about the evaluation issue, but are more immediately concerned with class size, diversity and discipline. Said one who spoke for many, "The truth will come out when we have 28 in a class for a full day. Whether we

learned anything that we can use this summer is a big question. It's one thing to do it with the two of us and just a few kids, but it is going to be a lot harder this Fall."

These concerns provoke anxiety, but not inaction. Teachers, paraprofessionals and administrators want to be successful in transferring their new skills to the regular school setting and sound eager to try. With the support proposed by the project, and with an understanding that full implementation will take considerable time and will not always go smoothly, the summer training should be sufficient to result in implementation during the year.

This report has used general descriptions, examples and questionnaire data to report the excellent quality with which the HESI clinical experience was implemented. The success of HESI is assuredly dependent on the quality of the training and experiences provided by the Hartford Public School system. However, HESI's success is also dependent on the commitment and involvement of the participants. Hartford teachers, paraprofessionals and principals should be commended for their significant role in making HESI successful.

Appendix A

Pre-Clinical Training Evaluation Form
Summer Training Evaluation

SUMMER TRAINING EVALUATION

Hartford Effective Schools Initiative

We asked you previously to evaluate the one week of training provided by Robin Hunter. Now, we ask that you assist us by evaluating the five weeks of follow-up training by completing this form.

I. PARTICIPANT DESCRIPTION

School: Hooker _____
King _____
Sand _____

Position: Teacher _____
Paraprofessional _____
Administrator _____

II. TRAINING CONTENT

This section lists the trainer names and training objectives. Please rate the extent that you feel the objectives were achieved using the following scale:

1 Not At All
2 Somewhat
3 Mostly
4 Completely

Participants will be able to:

	(Carole Helstrom)				
1.	Identify the classroom responsibilities of the teacher.	1	2	3	4
2.	List and define the essential elements of instruction.	1	2	3	4
3.	Teach to an objective.	1	2	3	4
	(Robert Gutzman)				
4.	Use the principles of learning.	1	2	3	4
5.	Effectively use the tools of teaching.	1	2	3	4
6.	Monitor learning and adjust teaching when necessary.	1	2	3	4
7.	Effectively employ knowledge about learning to increase student success.	1	2	3	4
	(Faye Parmelee)				
8.	Use the principles of learning.	1	2	3	4
9.	Effectively use the tools of teaching.	1	2	3	4
10.	Design a plan to elicit productive student behavior.	1	2	3	4

(William Bircher/ John Del Grego)

11.	Use the components of lesson design.	1	2	3	4
12.	Use the principles of learning.	1	2	3	4
13.	Use the tools of teaching.	1	2	3	4

(Carole Helstrom)

14.	Understand the relationship between instructional skills and classroom management strategies.	1	2	3	4
15.	Design a plan to implement components of the model during the 1984-1985 year.	1	2	3	4

III. TRAINING PRESENTERS

Please evaluate the quality of the HESI trainers by indicating the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

SD Strongly Disagree
D Disagree
U Undecided
A Agree
SA Strongly Agree

1.	Clearly presented the material.					
	Carole Helstrom	SD	D	U	A	SA
	Robert Gutzman	SD	D	U	A	SA
	Faye Parmelee	SD	D	U	A	SA
	William Bircher	SD	D	U	A	SA
	John Del Grego	SD	D	U	A	SA
2.	Maintained liveliness in discussions.					
	Carole Helstrom	SD	D	U	A	SA
	Robert Gutzman	SD	D	U	A	SA
	Faye Parmelee	SD	D	U	A	SA
	William Bircher	SD	D	U	A	SA
	John Del Grego	SD	D	U	A	SA
3.	Used good examples to illustrate points.					
	Carole Helstrom	SD	D	U	A	SA
	Robert Gutzman	SD	D	U	A	SA
	Faye Parmelee	SD	D	U	A	SA
	William Bircher	SD	D	U	A	SA
	John Del Grego	SD	D	U	A	SA
4.	Responded clearly to question.					
	Carole Helstrom	SD	D	U	A	SA
	Robert Gutzman	SD	D	U	A	SA
	Faye Parmelee	SD	D	U	A	SA
	William Bircher	SD	D	U	A	SA
	John Del Grego	SD	D	U	A	SA

IV. COACHING

This section is broken into parts A, B and C. Please respond to only one section as follows:

A: Teacher Teams
B: Principals and Vice Principals
C: Paraprofessionals

After completing your section, please go on to Section V.

A. Teacher Teams: Section A to be completed by TEACHERS ONLY.

1. Did you and your team member(s) observe and and then coach each other? yes no

   If yes, approximately how many times did you coach each other over the five week period? ____

2. Each teaching team was assigned an outside teacher coach.

   a. Were you observed by your teacher coach? yes no

   b. If you were observed by your teacher coach, approximately how many times were you observed over the 5 week period? ____

   c. Was the follow-up conference with the teacher coach helpful? yes no not observed

   Any comments?

3. Teachers were also observed by principal teams.

   a. Were you observed by a principal team? yes no

   b. If you were observed by the principal team, approximately how many times over the 5 week period? ____

   c. Was the follow-up conference with the principal team helpful? yes no not observed

   Any comments?

4. Did you have adequate teaching materials and equipment? yes no

   Any comments?

B. Principals: Section B to be completed by PRINCIPALS AND VICE-PRINCIPALS ONLY.

1. Each administrator was assigned a coach.

a. How often was your coach with you during your post-observation conference with teachers? (check one)

All the Time ___ About Half the Time ___ Less Than Half the Time ___

b. In general, was the coach's participation helpful during the conference? yes no

Any comments?

c. Following the teacher conference you met with your coach. In general, was this meeting helpful? yes no

Any comments?

C. Paraprofessional: Section C to be completed by SAND AND KING PARAPROFESSIONALS ONLY.

Each day some Sand and King paraprofessionals rode the bus with students to and from the King school at lunch time.

1. If you rode the bus, did this interfere with your involvement in any training activities? (circle one)

yes no did not ride the bus

2. If yes, please explain.

V. TRAINING SESSIONS

1. What is your opinion of the length of the 5 week clinical training? (circle one)

   too short just right too long

   Any comments?

2. If the HESI training were repeated for a new group in the future, would you recommend it to a colleague? yes no

   If no, why not?

3. If the HESI training were repeated for a new group, what recommendations, if any, would you make for changes in the training?

Thank you for your assistance in the evaluation.

HAVE A NICE VACATION!

PRE-CLINICAL TRAINING EVALUATION FORM

Hartford Effective Schools Initiative

Please assist us in evaluating the week of training by completing this form.

I. PARTICIPANT DESCRIPTION

School: Hooker _____ King _____ Sand _____ Other _____

Position: Teacher _____ Paraprofessional _____ Administrator _____

II. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

Training Time: 1 week _____ 6 weeks _____

This section lists the objectives of the training workshop. Please rate the extent that you feel the objectives were achieved using the following scale:

1 Not At All
2 Somewhat
3 Mostly
4 Completely

Participants will be able to:

1. List the three categories of teacher decisions.	1	2	3	4
2. List the six variables of motivation and the generalizations of each.	1	2	3	4
3. List the four principles of reinforcement theory and the definition of each.	1	2	3	4
4. Design a behavior strategy to change an unproductive individual or group behavior.	1	2	3	4
5. List, explain and apply the variables of effective practice.	1	2	3	4
6. List the steps of task analysis and apply it to a self-selected content area.	1	2	3	4
7. List and explain the elements of lesson design.	1	2	3	4
8. Observe lessons and label elements of effective teaching.	1	2	3	4
9. Explain the functions of both halves of the brain.	1	2	3	4
10. List the three implications of brain research in education.	1	2	3	4
11. List, explain and apply the six levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.	1	2	3	4

COMMENTS

III. TRAINING PRESENTER

Please evaluate the quality of the HESI trainer by indicating the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

SD Strongly Disagree
D Disagree
U Undecided
A Agree
SA Strongly Agree

The Trainer:

1. Clearly presents the material.	SD	D	U	A	SA
2. Maintains liveliness in discussions.	SD	D	U	A	SA
3. Uses good examples to illustrate points.	SD	D	U	A	SA
4. Responds clearly to questions.	SD	D	U	A	SA
5. Models the described teacher behaviors.	SD	D	U	A	SA

COMMENTS

IV. TRAINING CONTENT

Please rate the quality of the training content using the following scale:

1 Very Poor
2 Poor
3 Acceptable
4 Good
5 Very Good

1. Use of transparencies	1	2	3	4	5
2. Time allocated to topics	1	2	3	4	5
3. Opportunity to ask questions	1	2	3	4	5
4. Sequence of topics	1	2	3	4	5
5. Quality of information presented	1	2	3	4	5

COMMENTS

6. Please indicate whether and to what extent you took notes.

a. Did you take notes? yes no

b. If yes, to what extent did you take notes?

a few main points _____
a few main points and examples _____
most main points and examples _____
extensive notes of all points and examples _____

V. TRAINING OUTCOMES

1. Each of you came to the training with your own expectations with respect to what you hoped to learn. To what extent were your expectations met? (check one).

Not at all _____
Somewhat _____
Met my expectations _____
More than expected _____

2. List a few of the most important things you got from the training.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. What changes, if any, would you recommend in the training if it were done again in the future for another school staff?

2. What do you think would be most helpful for you during the next five weeks of training?

Thank you for your assistance in the evaluation!

Appendix B

Teacher and Paraprofessional
Comments from the Summer Evaluation Form

TEACHER COMMENTS

General Planning and Logistics

"Some kind or type of design should have been implemented to measure the growth of the program. Period where parents could have visited program."

"Something should be designed to measure growth with the children that were taught in the program. One day for parent open house should have been included in the program."

"Clearly defined goals/objectives of program; room set up/prep time immediately before students are to enter."

"Divide groups for interaction and exchange of ideas; during the six week period I did not have the opportunity to meet teachers from other schools except the ones that I already knew so interaction was limited in this sense."

"Inform new group exactly what essentials of program are to facilitate choices of types of materials to order."

"More initial planning and preparation was needed prior to teachers entering their classrooms!"

"Having the conferences on Mondays and practicing the techniques the rest of the week."

"Do not think that it is necessary to have two hours planning time every afternoon. Excellent program."

"More preparation time without interruption for meetings; shorten the first week conference in such way that allows for teachers to become prepared."

"Longer lunches; no meetings during lunches with university professors or the like; coffee every Friday."

"Something should be planned on afternoons when there is no training (too much free time from 11:30-2:00) or should be dismissed earlier (for instance 1:00).

"Increase pay and work out better pay schedule. Just have Friday as inservice (8:30-2:30) instead of a Wednesday. Be upfront with amount of money teachers are allowed, both supplies and extra materials. Have a special day for students and staff at the end of program - a movie at a theater or rollerskating."

"I think after the children left there was a lot of time for the teachers to stay till 2:00. Materials ordered never arrived, what happened to our $50.00 for materials?"

"Pay for whole summer - many participants gave up summer jobs to be involved in this program -- pay 8 weeks."

"Increase the pay for participants."

"Train the principal in advance, before the training for teachers begins, so that they can be more helpful to the teachers while the training takes place. I had hoped that principals, prime evaluators of their staff, had had more time to spend in the classrooms observing and contributing to cement new learning for their teachers. Comments: What really helped me to internalize the model was having the respondibility of writing a paper to reflect how I was implementing it in the classroom."

Materials

"Essential materials, erasers, yardstick, etc."

"To provide the material needed for the training so the teacher provides variety to their students."

"Supplies in order for teachers."

"Provide more supplies."

"Dittos (more detailed) so that notetaking can be minimized and listening increased; more videos of application of principles."

"Video tapes -- Hunter tapes during the week did not apply to elementary teaching."

"Materials should be available; pros/cons of the program should be clarified before entering the training; avoid repetition throughout the six week conference."

Training Time

"One full training week with Rob Hunter; 4 weeks with students."

"To give the teachers at least a week break after regular school, then start the training sessions."

"That the number of weeks are shortened to 4 or 5."

"Shorter periods of intense training; concentration on one component at a time, then practice-implement-feedback."

"Afternoons were too long (12:15-2:30)."

"Shorter or make better plans for the afternoon after students leave. I would very definitely end the day at 1:00 p.m. Concentrate on particular needs of schools."

"Dismissal of staff at 1:30."

"Shorter length of time - 4 weeks with the children would be sufficient."

Students

"Make sure you have at least 10 children to work with. Make sure you select a partner who will give you input as far as working together."

"Aim for a minimum number of children per classroom."

"More students in classroom needed (10-15): greater preparation needed for getting student participation; more observations -- formal and informal -- possibly every day."

"To select lower achievers and behavioral problems among the kids chosen for the program to make the practice more realistic."

"A better system of recruiting kids for the program should be established."

Coaching

"More coaching time/observations by principals and coaches."

"Coaching was slow in starting (creating stress over the unknown) and observations were then too infrequent -- this was a critical time to receive feedback to cement new elements of learning. Coaching schedules were not followed and coaching procedures were not explained."

"Need more coaching."

"Check for partnership to see if they are planning equally together."

Presenters

"More speakers who are practical and interesting and tuned into our teaching environment; additional hands-on or other afternoon activities that are optional and fun...some felt the p.m. time set aside for planning was too long or not needed--some were bored; additional experts in subject areas to add to our program so that we can also add their ideas into our new framework."

"Get more group participation and lessen the speaker participation or control."

"Inclusion of a few trainers with specific URBAN experience as well as more relevant training tapes."

"First week with Robin Hunter should have been in a better location (more comfortable). One week with just Robin Hunter was too long. He is very good but after 2 days it's enough."

"Make sure presenters are able to answer questions that participants feel are important to their effectiveness."

"Use local people as trainers."

"More modeling of specific skills by consultant, i.e., motivation, reinforcement, retention, etc."

Program Content

"Stressing a more POSITIVE approach to dealing with student behavior, and more examples of dealing with the typical behavior found in an overcrowded, diverse level classroom situation."

"Madeline Hunter seems to concentrate on 'lesson design.' There should be a section in her model that includes 'An Engineered Classroom.' Many teachers are very well equipped with lesson plans, instructional skills, etc. However, many teachers have problems in classroom management - 'Engineered Classroom' - example - see Hewett. Also, can you provide some data that includes some 'model' being implemented in the 'Inner City Schools.?'"

"To become more aware of the approaches and to include how to deal effectively with the negative approach of the problem child."

"Offer training to those of us who would like to take it again; smaller amount of material presented; diversity in consultants; videos should reflect same population as Hartford but not necessarily be Hartford; videos would be more effective if demonstrations were on elementary level."

PARAPROFESSIONAL COMMENTS

"More activities for para's after lunch."

"More involvement from para in planning sessions. The entire bussing situation could be smoother and more efficient with better planning. Get para input on this!"

"During the afternoon lunch, we should have the rest of the time to use more constructively."

"Too much time wasted in the afternoon."

"Time change to 8:30-12:30."

"We don't need 2 hour planning periods in the afternoon."

"Four weeks might have been a little better."

"Too much idle time after children were gone (meeting session too long!)."

"As a para with limited formal training, I personally welcomed this intensive period of education. I'm certain that it will (and has) helped me in the year to come."

Finally, one administrator offered the following suggestion:

"Conferences should be held in a place which is not so big so that the participants are closer together and the conference has more personal contact."